

says "[w]e intend to as soon as we can," GTE "do[es] not provide the CSR through SIGS." [Cal PUC Workshop at 1276 (Seibold)]

In Washington, GTE took the position that it did not have to provide proprietary customer information without written authorization from the customer. [Washington Report at 47] This was determined to be an unreasonable "obstacle," and its position was rejected. [Washington Report at 48] GTE also resisted providing full electronic interfaces, and again, its position was rejected: "GTE should immediately implement an electronic interface to its OSS functions." [Washington Report at 49] As explained in terms applicable to all ILECs, "[t]he FCC Order was released on August 8, 1996," and "GTE has had a sufficient opportunity to inform itself regarding the requirements of the Order and to prepare its compliance with its terms and conditions." [Washington Report at 50]

*i. Other ILECs' Failures*

The Local Exchange Carrier Coalition (LECC), which consists of more than 300 non-Bell ILECs throughout the United States, asked the Commission to "extend the mandatory date for providing access to OSS functions to January 1, 1998" -- i.e., for a full year, assertedly because they could not meet the Order's deadline. [Second Order on Recon ¶ 3] The Commission denied the request.

*C. The Need for OSS Compliance by the ILECs*

In its Second Reconsideration Order, the Commission concluded "that providing access to OSS functions is a critical requirement for complying with section 251, and incumbent LECs that do not provide access to OSS functions, in accordance with the *First Report and Order*, are not in full compliance with section 251." [Second Order on Recon ¶ 11] Further, while the Commission noted that it did "not anticipate initiating enforcement action against incumbent

LECs that are making good faith efforts to provide such access within a reasonable period of time, pursuant to an implementation schedule approved by the relevant state commission,” it made clear that “[w]e do not, however, preclude initiating enforcement action where circumstances warrant”[Second Order on Recon ¶ 11] and gave the assurance that it “would ‘monitor closely the progress of industry organizations as they implement the rules adopted in this proceeding.’” [Second Order on Recon ¶ 13 (citing Order ¶ 528)] In addition, the Commission has recognized that “operational issues may be among the most difficult for the parties to resolve,” and that it “will be called upon to enforce . . . [its] rules relating to these operational barriers to entry.” [Order ¶ 19] In that context, and “[b]ecause of the critical importance of eliminating these barriers to the accomplishment of the Act’s pro-competitive objectives,” the Commission gave its assurance that it “intend[ed] to enforce our rules in a manner that is swift, sure, and effective.” [Order ¶ 19] The Commission therefore concluded that it was “vital” for it to “vigilantly and vigorously enforce the rules that we adopt today,” recognizing that, “[i]f we fail to meet that responsibility, the actions that we take today to accomplish the 1996 Act’s pro-competitive, deregulatory objectives may prove to be ineffective.” [Order ¶ 20] And the Commission stressed that it “stands ready to provide guidance to states and other parties regarding the statute and our rules.” [Order ¶ 125]

The Commission should provide such guidance for OSS access through specific performance criteria, formulated through an expedited rulemaking. It is wholly appropriate for the Commission to set out minimum obligations that must be fulfilled by an ILEC before it is deemed to be in compliance with the OSS requirements of the Order and Second Order on Recon, as called for by Order ¶ 328 (“The language of section 252(c)(3) is cast exclusively in terms of obligations imposed on incumbent LECs”), particularly in view of at least one ILEC’s

having taken the position that the Order "is not absolutely clear with respect to ILEC obligations for OSS access" [US West Petition at 2] and another ILEC's construing "parity" to mean equality-of-access among CLECs [Sinn at 36-38] instead of equality-of-access with the ILEC [Order ¶¶ 316, 518, 523].

**D. Importance of Setting OSS Compliance Guidelines**

The ILECs continue their monopolies over local telephone markets. As matters now stand, competitive entry nationwide simply is not possible because, although the January 1, 1997 deadline has passed and continues to become more distant, the ILECs have failed to meet the OSS requirements set down by the Commission. There is no dispute that nondiscriminatory access to the ILECs' OSSs is an absolutely necessary prerequisite to effective entry and competition in local markets by CLECs, and that delay serves only to reward the ILECs unwarrantedly and unfairly prejudice the new possible entrants. Nor is there any dispute that, without such effective entry, consumers will not get the benefits of competition, in decreased prices and increased quality, that was promised to them by Congress through passage of the Act more than a year ago. [See Order ¶ 11 ("Congress addressed these problems in the 1996 Act by mandating that the most significant economic impediments to efficient entry into the monopolized local market must be removed"); see also Business Week at 42 ("competition could cut local costs by 20% or \$50 million a day")]

Setting clear OSS standards should provide a needed prod to the ILECs to do what the law requires and what they have known for long time they would have to do. Unfortunately, without such a prod, the ILECs are likely to continue to flout the law -- for it is in their economic interest, as well as perhaps in their nature, to do so. [See Order ¶ 10 ("Because an incumbent LEC currently serves virtually all subscribers in its local serving area, an incumbent LEC has

little economic incentive to assist new entrants in their efforts to secure a greater share of that market. An incumbent LEC also has the ability to act on its incentive to discourage entry and robust competition by not interconnecting its network with the new entrant's network") and ¶ 55 ("incumbent LECs have no economic incentive, independent of . . . the 1996 Act, to provide potential competitors with opportunities to interconnect with and make use of the incumbent LEC's network and services" and "incumbent LECs have strong incentives to resist [their] obligations" under the Act); see also Business Week at 42 ("Several of them [RBOCs] have revealed their anticompetitive tendencies by dragging out negotiations over letting new entrants resell their call-carrying capacity"); Dalton-R at 4 ("rather than working to make [UNE competition] happen, SWBT is working to make it not happen, doing all it can to make what should be a simple process complicated -- for competitors and customers")]

#### ***CONCLUSION/RELIEF REQUESTED***

The typical ILEC response to a showing of OSS shortcomings has been assurances that the shortcoming has been fixed since the complaint was levied or the finding made, or that it will be fixed at some point in the future. If the past be a guide, then, it might be expected that the ILECs will take a similar tack here. In this sense, the ILECs' progress on OSS is a constantly moving target. This fact cannot negate the acknowledged failure of every ILEC to meet the Commission's January 1, 1997 deadline and their continuing failure to do so, nor should it deter the Commission from taking action now to remedy the situation.

Petitioners therefore request that the Commission, on an expedited basis, enter an order requiring that:

- each ILEC disclose (a) each OSS function for which it has established performance standards for itself; and (b) each OSS function for which it has not established performance standards for itself, and

- where the ILEC has established performance standards for itself, that the ILEC further disclose precisely what those performance standards are, together with appropriate historical data and measurement criteria.

Petitioners further request that the Commission thereafter determine the appropriate minimum performance standards for each OSS function (including those functions for which the ILEC has not established performance standards for itself), so that each ILEC will be in compliance with the OSS requirements of the Order. Petitioners further request that the Commission establish any related OSS requirements (e.g., appropriate beta testing to ensure operability and scalability) that must be met by an ILEC in both the resale and unbundled environments, including the network platform. Petitioners finally request that the Commission model these performance standards on the standards formulated by the Local Competition Users Group, attached as Appendices A and B.

By so ordering, the Commission will give much needed clarity, structure and finality to the OSS debate now raging that will benefit all concerned. With such an order:

- the ILECs will know what must be done for them to be in compliance,
- the CLECs will know that no more can be expected,
- needless debate will cease on the criteria for OSS compliance by the ILECs and on whether and when parity of OSS access is achieved, and
- local competitors will no longer be stymied by the ILECs' OSS roadblock.

Most importantly, American consumers will benefit from the robust, open competition on the merits in the local telephone market, which inevitably will follow from CLECs having parity of access to fully-functioning OSS.

DATED: May 30, 1997

Respectfully submitted,

Anne K. Bingaman  
LCI INTERNATIONAL TELECOM CORP.

By: 

Genevieve Morelli  
Executive Vice President & General Counsel  
COMPTel

By: 

Eugene D. Cohen  
BAILEY CAMPBELL PLC

By: 

Rocky Unruh  
MORGENSTEIN & JUBELIRER

By: 

A

**Foundation For Local Competition:  
Operations Support Systems Requirements  
For  
Network Platform And Total Services Resale**

February 12, 1997

*Prepared By: Local Competition Users Group (LCUG)  
Membership: AT&T, MCI, Sprint, WorldCom and LCI*



# Table of Contents

<b>Core Principles .....</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Section 5. Provision of Customer Usage Data</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Section 1. General Business Requirements ...</b>	<b>4</b>	Recorded Usage Data	
Terms of Business Relationship		Controls and Lost Data	
ILEC/CI.EC Development Responsibilities		Performance Measurements	
<b>Section 2. Pre-Ordering .....</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Section 6. Maintenance .....</b>	<b>27</b>
Network Element Foundation		Service Parity	
Service Delivery Prerequisites		Emergency/Disaster Recovery Procedures	
Customer Information Requirements		System Interfaces	
Advance Notification Requirements		Performance Measurement and Reporting	
Performance Measurements		<b>Section 7. Miscellaneous Services and Functions ..</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Section 3. Ordering and Provisioning ... ..</b>	<b>13</b>	911 and E911 Requirements	
Service Parity		Directory Assistance Requirements	
Standards Compliance and Testing		Operator Service Requirements	
Electronic Interfaces		Directory Listing Requirements	
Performance Measurement			
<b>Section 4. Connectivity Billing and Recording</b>	<b>19</b>		
Settlement and Dispute Resolution Procedures			
Billing Format Standards			
Performance Measurements			

# Core Principles of Interconnection Agreements

## Service Parity

- ILEC must provide interconnection services that enable the CLEC to provide services to its customers at least equal in quality and timeliness to that offered by ILECs to their customers

## Notification of Change

- ILEC must provide sufficient advance notification of all changes in operating procedures, service offerings, etc., to afford the CLEC opportunity to respond

## Performance Measurement

- Service levels and cycle times must be established that enable the CLEC to provide its customers with expected levels of service

## Electronic Interfaces

- ILECs must provide CLECs with real-time electronic interfaces to ILEC systems that are seamless and transparent to users and facilitate ordering, provisioning, and maintenance activities

## Systems Integrity

- Interfaces between ILEC and CLEC systems must be developed according to industry standards, tested and accepted by CLECs. Adequate controls must be established to ensure data transfer integrity

## Standards Adherence

- ILECs must adhere to all current and future industry standards [e.g., (OBF), (ECHO)], and comply with all reasonable interim solutions as appropriate.

# 1 General Business Requirements

## Definition

This section describes the basis of the general business relationship between the ILEC and CLEC for the delivery of local access interconnection services (e.g., developing working procedures, training, etc.).

# General Business Requirements

## Terms of Business Relationship

- CLEC will be the primary contact and account control for all interactions with its subscribers
- During contact with subscribers the ILEC will ensure that its personnel:
  - provide appropriate CLEC referrals for new and existing customers
  - do not disparage or discriminate against the CLEC, its products, or services
  - do not cross-sell ILEC products and services during a subscriber inquiry about CLEC services
  - do not use the CLEC's subscriber information, orders, or processes/services to aid in the ILEC's marketing or sales efforts
- ILEC will notify the CLEC of any proposed changes in the terms and conditions under which it offers service
- ILEC will train CLEC employees on ILEC system interfaces and processes, and front end gateway interfaces
- ILEC will provide detailed product information

# General Business Requirements

## **ILEC/CLEC Development Responsibilities**

**ILEC and CLEC agree to:**

- **Establish escalation and expedite procedures that may be invoked at any point in the ordering, provisioning, maintenance and customer usage data transfer processes**
- **Establish contingency and disaster recovery plans for situations when normal processes are inoperable**
- **Develop and implement work center interface procedures for each function/business process**
- **Develop and deliver CLEC procedural training to all ILEC personnel who may communicate with CLEC subscribers**

# 2 Pre-Ordering

## Definition

This section describes the requirements that must be fulfilled by the ILEC before the CLEC is capable of initiating service.

# Pre-Ordering

## Network Element Foundation

- The ILEC must provide all capabilities of the unbundled network element ordered by the CLEC, including:
  - basic switching functions
  - telephone numbers
  - white page listings
  - dial tone
- The ILEC must provide on-line and timely electronic update of all listings of all custom features currently available from each end office, including:
  - custom calling
  - Custom Local Area Signaling Service (CLASS) features
  - CENTREX features
  - customized routing functions

# Pre-Ordering

## Service Delivery Prerequisites

- The ILEC must provide the CLEC with baseline and regularly refreshed information necessary to process orders, including:
  - Street Address Guide (SAG) data
  - Due date intervals for use in establishing service installation dates
  - Service and feature availability information
  - Engineering design and layout information
  - USOC codes and English translation.
  - Metropolitan Street Address Guide (MSAG) data
  - Appointment scheduling for service installation
- Until number administration functions are assumed by a neutral third party, the ILEC will:
  - Assign NXXs on a non-discriminatory basis
  - Reserve a block of telephone numbers per NPA-NXX where the CLEC has not obtained its own NXX
  - Provide testing and loading of the CLEC's NXXs on the same basis as performed for the ILEC's NXXs,
  - Provide CLEC with the ability to obtain telephone numbers, vanity numbers, etc , while a subscriber is on the line



# Pre-Ordering

## Customer Information Requirements

- **Subscriber payment history will be provided by the ILEC and CLEC to an independent third-party credit reporting agency**
  - information may only be made available to the carrier to which the subscriber has applied
  - ILEC cannot refuse service to the CLEC on the basis of a subscriber's past payment history
- **ILEC must provide the CLEC with real-time access to current customer profile, including:**
  - subscriber name
  - billing and service addresses
  - billed telephone numbers
  - identification of features and services on subscriber accounts (to include USOC codes and English translation)
- **ILEC must meet CLEC requirements and provide real time application to application electronic access to:**
  - telephone number reservation
  - due date reservation
  - feature function availability
  - facility availability
  - street address validation
  - customer service records (CSR)

# Pre-Ordering

## Advance Notification Requirements

- The ILEC must inform the CLEC of all changes to business processes and service offerings, including, but not limited to the following:
  - Services available from each switch
  - CLASS features and all other vertical features, including Centrex
  - List of available intralATA and interlATA carriers
  - Service coverage area of each switch
  - New ILEC service features, including trial offers and promotions
  - Planning/implementation of NPA splits
  - Method/plan for making ILNP and true LNP available

# Pre-Ordering

## Performance Measurements

- ILEC must comply with performance standards and provide reporting for the following measurements:
  - Successful query - response interval to obtain the following:
    - Telephone number reservation
    - Due date reservation
    - Feature function availability
    - Facility availability
    - Street address validation
    - Customer service records (CSR)
    - Service availability information
    - Appointment scheduling
  - Query Failure rates
  - Speed of Answer by Support Center
  - Speed of Inquiry Closure
- ILEC must provide reports detailing prescribed performance results on at least a monthly basis with sufficient historical data to allow trending:
  - for the ILEC itself,
  - all CLECs on average, and
  - the individual CLEC

# 3 Ordering and Provisioning

## Definition

This section describes the ordering and provisioning requirements to be followed by the H.EC.

# Ordering and Provisioning

## Service Parity

- ILEC must provide the same level of ordering and provisioning support to CLECs as it provides itself or its customers
- ILEC must provide a Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for ordering and provisioning resale service and unbundled elements, with capabilities including
  - a toll-free nationwide number
  - coordinated scheduling, status and dispatch capabilities
  - processing orders through an electronic interface 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
- ILEC must offer intraLATA toll for resale

# Ordering and Provisioning

## Service Parity (continued)

- ILEC shall not require a disconnect order to process a CLEC order or migrate a subscriber to CLEC service
  - ILEC shall provide unbranded intercept treatment and transfer of service announcements to CLEC subscribers for all disconnects, suspensions, or transfers
- ILEC must provide comprehensive support for CLEC ordering/provisioning activities, including but not limited to:
  - providing firm order confirmation (FOC)
  - rejected orders due to technical reasons, missing information, or jeopardy conditions
  - obtaining authorization for service order changes
  - processing service suspensions/restorations upon authorized request
  - providing daily disconnect notification as well as order completion notification
- ILEC shall provide CLECs the ability to order unbundled network elements with no disconnection or disruption of service. Subject to the CLECs' request, all or part of the unbundled network elements necessary to provide all or part of a service to a customer or group of customers must be provided

# Ordering and Provisioning

## Standards Compliance and Testing

- ILEC must comply with OBI and all other industry forums defined ordering and provisioning process guidelines and electronic implementation guidelines and standards
- ILEC shall perform comprehensive testing, including
  - pre-service testing prior to completion of the order
  - cooperative testing with CLEC
  - operational interface testing as requested

# Ordering and Provisioning

## Electronic Interfaces

- ILEC shall provide electronic interfaces to support all ordering and provisioning processes:
  - submitting orders and receiving confirmation of receipt
  - dispatching installation appointments
  - accessing subscriber information systems
  - providing service availability dates
  - receiving status information on service orders and installation
- Comply with the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) and all other industry forum defined interface guidelines for local service such as Local Service Request (LSR)
- Implement the OBF defined Local Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) as mechanized in EDI format by the EDI Service Order Subcommittee (SOSC) of the Telecommunications Industry Forum (TCIF)
- Provide gateway access for application-to-application real time interface capability



# Ordering and Provisioning

## Performance Measurement

- ILEC must comply with performance standards and provide reporting for the following measurements:
  - acknowledging orders
  - providing Firm Order Confirmation (FOC)
  - completing suspend/block/restore orders
  - notifying the CLEC of ILEC capability to complete expedited orders as requested
  - provisioning of total services resale
  - provisioning of unbundled network elements, including the network platform
  - providing switch translations
  - notifying CLEC of order completion
- ILEC must meet quality standards including, but not limited to, provisioning orders at a level of service quality determined by related outages, trouble dispatches, or subscribers calls
- ILEC must provide reports detailing prescribed performance results for the ILEC itself, all CLECs on average, and the individual CLEC on at least a monthly basis with sufficient historical data to allow trending